

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at least in page 9, line 6 through page 10, line 28 of the specification and FIGS. 3 and 5. No new matter has been added.

In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants request allowance of the Application.

CLAIMS 1-20 DEFINE OVER THE CITED ART

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly rendered obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0040369 to Multer et al. (hereinafter "Multer") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0065947 to Song et al. (hereinafter "Song") and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0008019 to Vert et al. (hereinafter "Vert") and U.S. Publication No. 2007/0180075 to Chasman et al. (hereinafter "Chasman") and "OTA Mobile Device Software Management" to Sudharshana et al. (hereinafter "Sudharshana") and U.S. Publication No. 2004/0064591 to Noble (hereinafter "Noble").

Multer, Song, Vert, Chasman, Sudharshana, and Noble, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest every limitation of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20, as is required to maintain a proper § 103(a) rejection.

Consider, claim 1, as amended, which recites in part the following subject matter:

retrieving, from an application resources database, ***an application resource*** to be deployed to the mobile device ***using a generated resource identifier*** (ID), comprising:

traversing a hierarchical class architecture corresponding to the particular application ***to identify a computing entity class having a device ID field value that matches the device ID*** received in the synchronization request;

mapping the device ID field value of the computing entity class to a resource type class having a device ID field value that matches the computing entity class device ID field value;

returning a resource type ID stored in a resource type ID field of the resource type class; and

generating the resource ID from the returned resource type ID, the associated device profile and the associated configuration parameter, and

The Office Action admits Multer, Song, Vert, and Chasman fail to teach or suggest this subject matter. *See* Office Action of January 13, 2010, p. 6. The Office Action alleges Sudharshana remedies the deficiencies of Multer, Song, Vert, Chasman. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Sudharshana generally discusses a software architecture for over the air management of software on a mobile device. *See* Sudharshana, p. 1, col. 1, Abstract. Sudharshana discusses upgrading software on a mobile equipment (ME) by applying software patches during an over the air synchronization process between a management server and a management client. Sudharshana, p. 2, col. 2, section 3.1 and FIGS. 2 and 3. Sudharshana describes a management server that maintains a Management Information Base (MIB), which stores different software patches that a ME needs to download. Sudharshana, however, fails to teach or suggest that retrieval of a software patch occurs by traversing a hierarchical class architecture corresponding to a particular application and mapping a received device ID to a resource type ID. Sudharshana further fails to teach or suggest that the returned resource type ID is used in part to generate a resource ID specific to the application and the device, such that the appropriate application resource may be retrieved and used to configured the mobile device. This is evident from the fact that Sudharshana assigns a "unique ID" to each generated patch; this unique ID is not derived from the device or application to which the patch applies. *See* Office Action of January 13, 2010, p. 6 (admitting Sudharshana does not disclose generation of a resource ID from both the associated device profile and the associated configuration parameter). Thus, Sudharshana fails to cure the deficiencies of Multer, Song, Vert, and Chasman.

Noble also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Multer, Song, Vert, Chasman, and Sudharshana. Noble discusses a method and system for facilitating the configuration of a computer device for access to various networks. As Noble is not directed to retrieving application resources, it does not teach or suggest the above-recited subject matter. In particular, when a network is encountered, Noble at best teaches a simple lookup among network configuration data for a matching network identifier. Noble, paragraph [0034]. Noble does not teach or suggest that a device ID is used to traverse a hierarchical class architecture

to return a resource type ID, and that the resource type ID is used in combination with the device ID and associated application configuration parameters to generate a resource ID corresponding to the application resource to be retrieved.

Noble also does not teach or suggest the generation of an application resource ID from a resource type ID, an associated device profile, and a configuration parameter. Noble generates a network identifier by combining a conventional SSID network identifier with the IP address of a device on the network and/or the MAC address of a network access device. Noble, paragraph [0033]. None of these addresses and identifiers are application- or application resource-specific, nor does the generated network identifier permit a particular application resource to be retrieved and used in configuring an application on a mobile device.

For at least this reason, Multer, Song, Vert, Chasman, Sudharshana, and Noble, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of independent claim 1, as is required to maintain a proper § 103(a) rejection. Independent claims 8, 13, and 20 are not rendered obvious by these references for similar reasons. Claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-19 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 13 and are similarly not rendered obvious for these reasons. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Serial No.: 10/720,073
Amendment dated: April 12, 2010
Reply to Non-Final Office Action dated January 13, 2010

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: April 12, 2010

/Mark D. Yuan/

Mark D. Yuan

(Registration No.: 57,312)

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501